

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES  
(Attorney Docket № 14306US02)**

In the Application of:

Jeyhan Karaoguz, et al.

Serial No. 10/675,081

Filed: September 30, 2003

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR MEDIA  
EXCHANGE NETWORK  
FUNCTIONALITY SYNCHRONIZED  
WITH MEDIA BROADCASTING

Examiner: Patrick A. Ryan

Group Art Unit: 2427

Confirmation No. 5083

**Electronically filed on 21-SEP-2009**

**REVISED APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from an Office Action dated January 14, 2009 (“Final Office Action”), in which claims 1-31 were finally rejected. **This Revised Appeal Brief is also in response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed on August 25, 2009.** The Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (“Board”) reverses the final rejection of claims 1-31 of the present application. The Appellant notes that this Appeal Brief is timely filed within the period for reply that ends on June 8, 2009.

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))**

Broadcom Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the state of California, and having a place of business at 5300 California Avenue, Irvine, California 92617, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment recorded at Reel 014252, Frame 0787 in the PTO Assignment Search room.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))**

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))**

Claims 1-31 were finally rejected. Pending claims 1-31 are the subject of this appeal.

The present application includes claims 1-31, which are pending in the present application. Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 ("Shoff"). The Appellant identifies claims 1-31 as the

claims that are being appealed. The text of the pending claims is provided in the Claims Appendix.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))**

The Appellant has not amended any claims subsequent to the final rejection of claims 1-31 in the Final Office Action mailed on January 14, 2009.

**SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))**

The invention of claim 1 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 4-5, "Detailed Description of the Invention" section in pages 8-17, and in Figures 1-2. A method for providing access to information related to a broadcast television program is disclosed and may include delivering, via a single communication path (e.g., the single path between 102-104 and 104-103), the broadcast television program along with at least one synchronized functionality (e.g., 111 in Fig. 1) associated with the broadcast television program. See present specification at Fig. 1 and p. 12, ll. 13-23; step 201 in Fig. 2. The broadcast television program and the at least one synchronized functionality (e.g., 111) may be of the same format and for display on a television screen within a home (e.g., 106 in home 102). See *id.* at p. 12, ll. 4-5. The at least one synchronized

functionality may include at least one user-selectable option, and the at least one synchronized functionality may originate from the same broadcast provider location (e.g., 103 in Fig. 1) as the broadcast television program. See *id.* at p. 12, ll. 4-12. An input from a user may be received, where the input may select at least a portion of the at least one synchronized functionality associated with at least a portion of the broadcast television program, during the delivering. See *id.* at p. 12, ll. 13-23. In response to the received input, at least a portion of the at least one synchronized functionality associated with the at least a portion of the broadcast television program may be performed, at least in part outside the home (e.g., by the provider 103). See *id.* at p. 12, line 24 – p. 13, line 2; step 204 in Fig. 2.

Claims 2-10 are dependent upon claim 1.

Claim 2 discloses associating the at least one synchronized functionality (e.g., 111 in Fig. 1) with the broadcast television program. See *id.* p. 4, lines 8-9.

Claim 4 discloses broadcasting an indication of the at least one synchronized functionality (e.g., 111 in Fig. 1) along with the broadcast television program. See *id.* p. 4, lines 11-12.

Claim 10 discloses displaying information related to the performance of the at least a portion of the at least one synchronized functionality (e.g., 111 in Fig. 1). See *id.* p. 4, lines 15-18.

The invention of claim 11 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-

5, “Detailed Description of the Invention” section in pages 8-17, and in Figures 1-2. Another embodiment of the invention may provide a machine-readable storage, having stored thereon, a computer program having at least one code section for providing access to information related to a broadcast program. *See id.* at p. 4, ll. 19-21. The at least one code section may be executable by a machine, thereby causing the machine to perform the steps as described above in the method for providing access to information related to a broadcast program. *See id.* at p. 4, ll. 21-24.

Claims 12-20 are dependent upon claim 11.

The invention of claim 21 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-5, “Detailed Description of the Invention” section in pages 8-17, and in Figures 1-2. A system for providing access to information related to a broadcast television program is disclosed and may include at least one processor that delivers, via a single communication path (e.g., the single path between 102-104 and 104-103), the broadcast television program along with at least one synchronized functionality (e.g., 111 in Fig. 1) associated with the broadcast television program. *See id.* at Fig. 1 and p. 12, ll. 13-23; step 201 in Fig. 2. The broadcast television program and the at least one synchronized functionality (e.g., 111) may be of the same format and for display on a television screen within a home (e.g., 106 in home 102). *See id.* at p. 12, ll. 4-5. The at least one synchronized functionality may include at least one user-selectable option, and the at least one synchronized functionality may originate from the same broadcast

provider location (e.g., 103 in Fig. 1) as the broadcast television program. *See id.* at p. 12, ll. 4-12. The at least one processor may receive an input from a user that selects at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality associated with at least a portion of the broadcast television program, during the delivering. *See id.* at p. 12, ll. 13-23. The at least one processor may perform the at least a portion of the at least one synchronized functionality associated with the at least a portion of the broadcast television program, at least in part outside of the home and in response to the received input. *See id.* at p. 12, line 24 – p. 13, line 2; step 204 in Fig. 2.

Claims 22-31 are dependent upon claim 21.

**GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))**

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 (“Shoff”).

**ARGUMENT**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))**

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shoff.

**I. Shoff Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-31**

The Appellant now turns to the rejection of claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shoff. With regard to the anticipation rejections under 102(e), MPEP 2131 states that “[a] claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) at 2131 (internal citation omitted). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See *id.* (internal citation omitted).

Without conceding that Shoff qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

**A. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 11, and 21**

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Appellant submits that Shoff does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “the broadcast television program and said at least one synchronized functionality being of

the same format and for display on a television screen within a home,” as recited by the Appellant in independent claim 1.

The Final Office Action states the following:

With respect to Claim 1, Shoff teaches a method for providing access to information related to a broadcast television program (generally shown in Figs. 2, 6, 7, and 9), the method comprising:

delivering, via a single communication path, the broadcast television program along with ***at least one synchronized functionality associated with the broadcast television program ("target resource contains digital data which supports interactive functionality in conjunction with the associated video content program"*** and that defines parameters such as display layout or timing information to synchronize the presentation, as described in Col. 9 Line 66-Col. 10 Line 17; with further reference to "the digital data is packaged with the video stream and transmitted as one signal from the headend", as described in Col. 10 Lines 17-24 and Network 32 of Fig. 2), *the broadcast television program and said at least one synchronized functionality being of the same format and for display on a television screen within a home (transmission of digital data in vertical blank interval (VBI) between successive frames of the video, as disclosed in Col. 2 Lines 32-52 and Figs. 1, 8a-8c; with further reference to Col. 12 Lines 24-38),*

See Final Office Action at pages 4-5. The Examiner relies on Col. 2 Lines 32-52 and Figs. 1, 8a-8c, with further reference to Col. 12 Lines 24-38 of Shoff. In col. 2 (with reference to Fig. 1), Shoff discloses that the Internet data (which the Examiner analogizes to Appellant's "synchronized functionality") can be a Web page and can be combined with the video data to form a single signal. The Appellant notes that Shoff's supplemental information (e.g., the Web page) is in hypertext format, which is obviously different from the format of the television video data being displayed in pane 16.



Based on the above bolded citation, the Examiner has also equated Appellant's "synchronized functionality" with Shoff's "target resource." As explained by Shoff, the "target resource" contains digital data, which "defines the supplemental content to enable viewer interactivity". The digital data also defines a display layout prescribing how the supplemental content and the video program are to appear, and defines timing information to synchronize presentation of the supplemental content with the video content program. See Shoff at col. 9, line 66 – col. 10, line 17. However, even though the digital data facilitates the display of the supplemental information, **the digital data of the target resource is not the actual supplemental information. Shoff's supplemental information is constructed as a hypertext file, which is rendered by a browser at the viewer location and is of different format when compared with the received television signal.**

Therefore, the Appellant maintains that Shoff does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "the broadcast television program and said at least one synchronized functionality being of the same format and for display on a television screen within a home," as recited by the Appellant in independent claim 1.

Furthermore with regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Appellant submits that Shoff does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "wherein said at least one synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program," as recited by the Appellant in independent claim 1.

The Final Office Action states the following:

said at least one synchronized functionality comprising at least one user-selectable option ("Display Icon Indicating Interactive" at Step 162, which is displayed based on a determination of the existence of interactive data at Step 152 from EPG, as described in Col. 8 Line 62-Col. 9 Line 40), and wherein said at least one synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program (Video Programs 40, Program Information 46, and Supplemental Content 54 distributed from Headend 22 of Fig. 2, as described in Col. 4 Line 42-Col. 5 Line 60; with further reference to Fig. 9 showing the method of authoring an interactive entertainment program, as described in Col. 12 Line 39-67);

See the Final Office Action at page 5. Referring to FIG. 2 of Shoff, the headend 22 provides on-demand video streaming of video programs stored in the database 40 within the continuous media server 42. The headend 22 can also communicate broadcast video signals to its subscribers. **However, by definition, a cable headend is a master facility for receiving (e.g., from the broadcast signal source) television signals for processing and distribution over a cable television system. In this regard, Shoff's broadcast video signals are only being selectively re-transmitted by the headend 22, since the broadcast signals originate from a satellite feed or a cable system feed, i.e., the broadcast signals originate remotely from the headend 22. In this regard, Shoff's broadcast video signals and the supplemental content do not originate from the same broadcast provider location.**

Even if we assume arguendo that Shoff's broadcast video signals and supplemental content originate from the same location, Shoff is still deficient since, as

already explained above, it does not disclose that the broadcast television program and the supplemental information are of the same format.

Therefore, the Appellant maintains that Shoff also does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "wherein said at least one synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program," as recited by the Appellant in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Shoff and is allowable. Independent claims 11 and 21 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 11 and 21 are also allowable over the reference cited in the Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

## **B. Examiner's Response to Appellant's Arguments**

The Final Office Action states the following:

Applicant's arguments, see Reply Pages 12-17, with respect to the teachings of Walker et al. in addressing the limitations of Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been fully considered, but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection. However, in response to Applicant's arguments regarding the interpretation of the claim language "supplemental information" as equivalent to "synchronized functionality", the Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that "supplemental information" is only mentioned in dependent Claims 7, 17, and 27; not Claims 1, 11, and 21; the Examiner does not interpret these terms to be equivalent.

See Final Office Action at pages 2-3. Even though the Examiner is no longer relying on Walker, the Appellant will briefly address the above statements for completeness. With reference to Appellant's language regarding interpretation of the claim language (e.g., page 14 of the 11/06/08 response), the Appellant was simply pointing out that Appellant's "synchronized functionality" (as used in Appellant's claim 1) was equated by the Examiner to Walker's "supplemental information" (See 08/20/08 Office Action at page 3). The Appellant was not referring to "supplemental information" as used in claim 7 by the Appellant.

The Final Office Action further states:

Applicant's arguments, see Reply Pages 17-19, with respect to the teachings of Shoff et al. in addressing the limitations of Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Applicant presents that Shoff does not disclose or suggest the Claim 1 limitation "wherein said at least one synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program" because "the broadcast video signals are re-transmitted since they originate from a satellite feed or a cable system feed, i.e., remotely from the headend 22" (Reply Page 18). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner notes that Applicant provides no support for Shoff teaching the retransmission of broadcast video signals from headend 22 and further notes that Fig. 2 of Shoff demonstrates headend 22 as the only source of information. The Examiner also notes that Applicant's Claim 1 requires that the "synchronized functionality originates", but a point of origin for the broadcast programming is not required. Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that Shoff teaches the transmission of broadcast video (i.e. video programs 40) and synchronized functionality (as part of supplemental content 54) from the same broadcast provider (headend 22) to viewer computing unit 24 by way of network 32, as shown in Fig. 2 and described in Col. 4 Lines 42-61.

See Final Office Action at page 3. The Appellant respectfully disagrees. The relevant language from Appellant's claim 1 is "wherein said at least one synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program." The Appellant maintains that this language is sufficiently clear on its face, providing that the broadcast television program and the synchronized functionality originate from the same broadcast provider location, which is not disclosed by Shoff. Additional deficiencies of Shoff are explained in Section I-A, as well as herein below.

**C. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2, 12, and 22**

Claims 2, 12, and 22 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 2, 12, and 22 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Shoff does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "associating said at least one synchronized functionality with the broadcast television program," as recited by the Appellant in claims 2, 12, and 22.

With regard to claim 2, the Final Office Action states the following at page 6:

With respect to Claim 2, Shoff teaches the method according to Claim 1 comprising associating said at least one synchronized functionality with the broadcast television program (digital data including "timing information" included with broadcast of video data, as described in Col. 10 Lines 7-24, Lines 34-58; with further reference to Step 245 of Fig. 9, as described in Col. 12 Lines 39-47).

The Appellant respectfully disagrees. Shoff's "digital data" of the target resource is not the actual supplemental information and it is not associated with the broadcast television program. Instead, the digital data is related to the supplemental information as it defines timing information to synchronize the presentation of the supplemental content. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claims 2, 12, and 22 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 2, 12, and 22.

**D. Rejection of Dependent Claims 3, 13, and 23**

Claims 3, 13, and 23 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 3, 13, and 23 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 3, 13, and 23.

**E. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 14, and 24**

Claims 4, 14, and 24 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 4, 14, and 24 are allowable over the

references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Shoff does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "broadcasting an indication of said at least one synchronized functionality along with the broadcast television program," as recited by the Appellant in claims 4, 14, and 24.

With regard to claim 4, the Final Office Action states the following at page 6:

With respect to Claim 4, Shoff teaches the method according to Claim 1 comprising broadcasting an indication of said at least one synchronized functionality along with the broadcast television program ("indication that program is interactive compatible and that there is supplemental content for the program", as dictated by EPG Data Field 158, as described in Col. 8 Line 62-Col. 9 Line 19).

The Appellant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner relies for support on Figs. 6-7, which illustrate a method for operating an interactive entertainment system to enhance a conventional continuous video data stream. Even though Shoff discloses (at step 158 in Fig. 6) that a target specification may be retrieved from the EPG (which would indicate that there is supplemental content available for the video data stream), Shoff still does not disclose that an indication of the synchronized functionality is in fact broadcast along with the broadcast television program. As seen in Fig. 5, the program source and the supplemental content source are different. In addition, as explained above, the headend is not an originating broadcast provider and it is not possible for an indication of available supplemental content (which originates from the EPG server) to be broadcast along with the broadcast television program (which is simply being re-

transmitted by the headend). Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claims 4, 14, and 24 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 4, 14, and 24.

**F. Rejection of Dependent Claims 5, 15, and 25**

Claims 5, 15, and 25 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 5, 15, and 25 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 5, 15, and 25.

**G. Rejection of Dependent Claims 6, 16, and 26**

Claims 6, 16, and 26 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 6, 16, and 26 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.



The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 6, 16, and 26.

**H. Rejection of Dependent Claims 7, 17, and 27**

Claims 7, 17, and 27 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 7, 17, and 27 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 7, 17, and 27.

**I. Rejection of Dependent Claims 8, 18, and 28**

Claims 8, 18, and 28 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 8, 18, and 28 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 8, 18, and 28.

**J. Rejection of Dependent Claims 9, 19, and 29**

Claims 9, 19, and 29 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 9, 19, and 29 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 9, 19, and 29.

**K. Rejection of Dependent Claims 10, 20, and 30**

Claims 10, 20, and 30 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 10, 20, and 30 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Shoff does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “displaying information related to said performance of said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality,” as recited by the Appellant in claims 10, 20, and 30.

With regard to claim 10, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

With respect to Claim 10, Shoff teaches the method according to Claim 1 comprising displaying information related to said performance of said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality (Viewer Computing Unit 24 runs electronic program guide (EPG) that displays various listings of programs including Data Field 58 that indicates the existence and location of interactive content, as described Col. 4 Lines 35-42, Col. 5 Line 61-Col. 6 Line 22).

The Appellant respectfully disagrees. Initially, the Appellant points out that “performance” in claim 10 refers to “performing ...said at least one synchronized functionality ...at least in part outside said home.” For example, after the user has selected supplemental content as the “synchronized functionality”, obtaining such supplemental content can be performed outside of the user’s home. Claim 10 now refers to, for example, displaying information that is related to the obtaining of such supplemental content as it occurs outside the home. Even though Shoff’s EPG displays information regarding the web location and description of the supplemental content, Shoff still does not display any information relating to the actual performance of the synchronized functionality (e.g., the act of obtaining the supplemental content).

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 10, 20, and 30.

**L. Rejection of Dependent Claim 31**

Claim 31 depends on independent claim 21. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claim 31 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 10, 20, and 30.

### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Appellant submits that claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the Examiner's rejection and issuance of a patent on the application are therefore requested.

The Brief on Appeal Fee has already been paid.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 21, 2009

By: /Ognyan I. Beremski/  
Ognyan Beremski, Reg. No. 51,458  
Attorney for Appellant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.  
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
Telephone: (312) 775-8000  
Facsimile: (312) 775 – 8100

(OIB)

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))**

1. A method for providing access to information related to a broadcast television program, the method comprising:

delivering, via a single communication path, the broadcast television program along with at least one synchronized functionality associated with the broadcast television program, the broadcast television program and said at least one synchronized functionality being of the same format and for display on a television screen within a home, said at least one synchronized functionality comprising at least one user-selectable option, and wherein said at least one synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program;

receiving an input from a user that selects at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality associated with at least a portion of the broadcast television program, during said delivering; and

in response to said received input, performing said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality associated with said at least a portion of the broadcast television program, at least in part outside said home.

2. The method according to claim 1, comprising associating said at least one synchronized functionality with the broadcast television program.

3. The method according to claim 1, comprising notifying said user of said at least one synchronized functionality corresponding to the broadcast television program.

4. The method according to claim 1, comprising broadcasting an indication of said at least one synchronized functionality along with the broadcast television program.

5. The method according to claim 1, wherein said input is a code representative of said function.

6. The method according to claim 1, wherein said input is generated from at least one of a remote control, a keyboard, a scanning device and an audio processing device.

7. The method according to claim 1, comprising generating supplemental information related to the broadcast television program in response to said received input.

8. The method according to claim 7, comprising presenting said supplemental information to said user.

9. The method according to claim 7, comprising presenting said supplemental information to said user concurrently with said delivering of the broadcast television program.

10. The method according to claim 1, comprising displaying information related to said performance of said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality.

11. A machine-readable storage having stored thereon, a computer program having at least one code section for providing access to information related to a broadcast television program, the at least one code section being executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform steps comprising:

delivering, via a single communication path, the broadcast television program along with at least one synchronized functionality associated with the broadcast

television program, the broadcast television program and said at least one synchronized functionality being of the same format and for display on a television screen within a home, said at least one synchronized functionality comprising at least one user-selectable option, and wherein said at least one synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program;

receiving an input from a user that selects at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality associated with at least a portion of the broadcast television program, during said delivering; and

in response to said received input, performing said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality associated with said at least a portion of the broadcast television program, at least in part outside said home.

12. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for associating said at least one synchronized functionality with the broadcast television program.

13. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for notifying said user of said at least one synchronized functionality corresponding to the broadcast television program.

14. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for broadcasting an indication of said at least one synchronized functionality along with the broadcast television program.

15. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, wherein said input is a code representative of said function.

16. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, wherein said input is generated from at least one of a remote control, a keyboard, a scanning device and an audio processing device.

17. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for generating supplemental information related to the broadcast television program in response to said received input.

18. The machine-readable storage according to claim 17, comprising code for presenting said supplemental information to said user.

19. The machine-readable storage according to claim 17, comprising code for presenting said supplemental information to said user concurrently with said delivering of the broadcast television program.

20. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code that causes information related to said performance of said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality to be displayed.

21. A system for providing access to information related to a broadcast television program, the system comprising:

at least one processor that delivers, via a single communication path, the broadcast television program along with at least one synchronized functionality associated with the broadcast television program, the broadcast television program and said at least one synchronized functionality being of the same format and for display on a television screen within a home, said at least one synchronized functionality comprising at least one user-selectable option, and wherein said at least one



synchronized functionality originates from the same broadcast provider location as the broadcast television program;

said at least one processor receives an input from a user that selects at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality associated with at least a portion of the broadcast television program, during said delivering; and

said at least one processor performs said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality associated with said at least a portion of the broadcast television program, at least in part outside said home in response to said received input.

22. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor associates said at least one synchronized functionality with the broadcast television program.

23. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor notifies said user of said at least one synchronized functionality corresponding to the broadcast television program.

24. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor broadcasts an indication of said at least one synchronized functionality along with the broadcast television program.

25. The system according to claim 21, wherein said input is a code representative of said function.

26. The system according to claim 21, wherein said input is generated from at least one of a remote control, a keyboard, a scanning device and an audio processing device.

27. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor generates supplemental information related to the broadcast television program in response to said received input.

28. The system according to claim 27, wherein said at least one processor presents said supplemental information to said user.

29. The system according to claim 27, wherein said at least one processor presents said supplemental information to said user concurrently with said delivering of the broadcast television program.

30. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor displays information related to said performance of said at least a portion of said at least one synchronized functionality.

31. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one processor is one or more of a media processing system processor, a media management system processor, a computer processor, media exchange software processor and/or a media peripheral processor.

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))**

- (1) U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 ("Shoff"), entered into record by the Examiner in the October 26, 2007 Office Action.

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))**

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.